

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (US 6,271,903) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970).

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. ('903) in view of Kim ('970) and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4, cancelled withdrawn claims 9-18 without prejudice or disclaimer, and added new claims 19 and 20. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-8, 19, and 20 are presently pending.

Request for PTO-892

Applicant respectfully requests that the next Communication from the USPTO include a PTO-892 citing Shin et al. (US 6,271,903), which was first cited in the Office Action dated June 21, 2005, and used as grounds for rejection.

Statement of Substance of the Interview

On November 8, 2005, Applicant's undersigned representative conducted a personal interview with the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful assistance provided and the courtesies extended during the Interview. During the Interview, the Office Action was discussing in view of the claims and the applied art. Specifically, the features of independent claims 1 and 4, as presently amended, and newly added dependent claims 19-20 were discussed.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. (US 6,271,903) in view of Kim (US 6,177,970), and claim 5 stands rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin et al. ('903) in view of Kim ('970) and Kim et al. (US 6,388,727). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, do not teach or suggest a combination including a pixel electrode and a common electrode that are disposed directly on an insulating layer that serves as a gate insulating layer of a thin film transistor, and further including an alignment film that directly contacts upper and side surfaces of the common line, and upper and side surfaces of the pixel electrode. In contrast, the structure illustrated in FIGs. 13 and 14 of Shin et al. ('903) disclose that the pixel electrode 29 and the common electrode 22 are not formed directly on an insulating layer, but instead, are formed with the gate insulating film disposed in-between the pixel and common electrodes 29 and 22. In further contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, FIGs. 13 and 14 of Shin et al. ('903) clearly show that the alignment film does not directly contact the common electrode at all. Moreover, in FIGs. 1 and 2 of Kim ('970), a protection insulation layer 80 (which is different than the gate insulating layer 50) is provided, and the common electrode and the pixel electrode 40 are formed on the protection insulation layer 80. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Final Office Action does not rely on Kim et al. to disclose any of these features and the Kim et al. cannot remedy any of these deficiencies.

In accordance with the claimed configuration, a more simple, efficient manufacturing method is provided as described, for example, at paragraph [0089] of the present application.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection of claims 1 and 4, as amended, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and should be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 19, and 20 are allowable at least because of the respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 4, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

New Claims 19 and 20

Applicant has added new dependent claims 19 and 20 to further define the invention. New dependent claims 19 and 20 both recite a liquid crystal display device wherein the pixel electrode is formed of a first material and the source and drain electrodes are formed of a second material different from the first material of the pixel electrode. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Shin et al. ('903) explicitly discloses a single layer of material is used for forming the drain electrode 28 and the pixel electrode 29, i.e., the drain and pixel electrodes 28 and 29 are formed of the same material. In addition, Kim ('970) fails to disclose the drain and pixel electrodes being formed of different materials. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Shin et al. ('903) nor Kim ('970), whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the combination of features recited by new dependent claims 19 and 20.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 
for Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No. 41,040
Kyle J. Choi
41,480

Dated: November 21, 2005

Customer Number: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
(202)739-3000